①

AD A126312

ASSESSMENT OF THE OENCO PILOT PROGRAM:
CLASS 1 RESULTS

John J. Kessler
and
Laurel W. Oliver

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL AREA

DTIC
S ELECTE D
APR 4 1983

B

ari

U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

July 1980

DTIC FILE COPY

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Note 83-15	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A126 312	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE *(and Subtitle)* ASSESSMENT OF THE OENCO PILOT PROGRAM: CLASS 1 RESULTS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim 1980-81
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) John J. Kessler, Laurel W. Oliver		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263731A792 Task A, Work Unit 002
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Human Resources Development Directorate Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Washington, DC 20310		12. REPORT DATE July 1980
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 73
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(*If different from Controlling Office*)		15. SECURITY CLASS. *(of this report)* UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of this Report)* Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)*		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS *(Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)* Organizational effectiveness (OE) Organizational development (OD) Noncommissioned officers (NCOs)		

20. ABSTRACT *(Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)*

    A pilot program was established for training and utilizing noncommissioned officers (NCOs) in organizational effectiveness (OE) work. Two classes of OENCOs (Organizational Effectiveness Noncommissioned Officers) were trained and placed in the field. This report contains information on the first class of 47 OENCOs and six other OENCOs who had previously been trained in the officer course. Questionnaires were administered to the OENCOs, their OESO supervisors, their Key Managers, and a sample of OE users. It was found that OENCOs and OESOs do many of the same things but with a different

20. (Continued)

emphasis. (OESOs spend more time in initial contacts and in planning, while OENCOs spend more time collecting data and performing implementations). Because of their senior NCO status, OENCOs may be more effective and credible than officers in dealing with enlisted personnel. All measures of effectiveness used to assess the program (attitudes, performance ratings, increase in OE office productivity, acceptance of OENCO, and OENCO job satisfaction) indicate that the program has been successful. The high degree of consistency of response across groups of respondents suggests that the results are highly reliable. The positive results of the program appear to be due, at least in part, to the selection criteria which were used.

This report is first in a 1980-81 series entitled "Assessment of the OENCO Pilot Program."

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 **1473**   EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

ASSESSMENT OF THE OENCO PILOT PROGRAM:
CLASS 1 RESULTS

John J. Kessler
and
Laurel W. Oliver

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained
in this report are those of the authors and should
not be construed as an official Department of
the Army position, policy, or decision, unless
so designated by others official documentation.

Submitted by:
T. Owen Jacobs, Chief
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL AREA

Approved by:
Edgar M. Johnson, Director
Organizations and Systems
Research Laboratory

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

July 1980

FOREWORD

ASSESSMENT OF THE OENCO PILOT PROGRAM: CLASS 1 RESULTS

BRIEF

Requirement:

Late in 1978, the Army decided to establish a pilot program for training
and utilizing noncommissioned officers (NCOs) to function as Organizational
Effectiveness (OE) practitioners in the Army.   Two classes of approximately
45 NCOs were trained and sent to the field.   The Army Research Institute
(ARI) was asked to evaluate the pilot program, and this report contains
information on the first class (Class 1-79) of Organizational Effectiveness
Noncommissioned Officers (OENCOs) participating in the pilot program.

Procedure:

Questionnaires were distributed to the OENCOs in Class 1-79, their OESO
supervisors, their Key Managers, and a sample of OE users (commanders who
had contracted for OE operations in which OENCOs had participated).

Findings:

1.   OENCOs play an OE consultant role similar to the one OESOs play,
     but their activities have a somewhat different emphasis (more time
     spent collecting information and performing implementations).

2.   As senior enlisted people, OENCOs bring a different perspective to
     the OE effort and may be more effective and credible than officers
     in dealing with enlisted personnel.

3.   All measures of effectiveness used to assess this pilot program
     indicate the program has been highly successful.

4.   The high degree of consistency of response across the four groups
     of respondents suggests that the results are highly reliable.

5.   The positive results of the program appear to be due, at least in
     part, to the selection criteria used.

Utilization of Findings:

These findings will be used to guide decisions concerning the future
training and utilization of OENCOs.

ASSESSMENT OF THE OENCO PILOT PROGRAM: CLASS 1 RESULTS

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Assessment of the OENCO Pilot Program: Class 1 Results

INTRODUCTION

Background

Late in 1978, the Army decided to establish a pilot program for training
and utilizing noncommissioned officers (NCOs) to do organizational effective-
ness (OE) work in the Army.   Training for Organizational Effectiveness Staff
Officers (OESOs) is at the Organizational Effectiveness Center and School
(OEC&S) at Ft Ord, California.   It is a 16-week course consisting of class-
room and work group instruction followed by a field training exerc'   (FTX)
during which the OESO receives supervised practice in the applicat'   of
techniques learned in the classroom, prior to graduation.   The pil   ⁻rain-
ing course for Organizational Effectiveness Noncommissioned Office'   ᵤOENCOs)
was almost identical to that for OESOs, consisting essentially of   first
10 weeks of classroom instruction, and omitting the FTX.   The rati   for
using essentially the same curriculum was that the OENCO should be   ₋ to
function in and be knowledgeable about the same operations as an OESO.   The
rationale for elimination of the FTX was that the OENCO would function under
the supervision of an OESO (as in the FTX) and would receive significant on-
the-job training from the OESO.   The pilot program involved two classes of
approximately 45 OENCOs each.   The first class (Class 1-79) completed its
10-week course at the Organizational Effectiveness Center and School (OEC&S)
on 23 March 1979.   The second class (Class 2-79) completed its course on
13 July 1979.

After the people in these two classes were trained and put in the
field, no more OENCOs were to be trained until the utility of the pilot
program could be assessed.   The 18-month tours of duty for the first class
were scheduled for completion in late fall of 1980.   If the OENCOs were to
be replaced by the end of their tours or shortly thereafter, a decision
concerning whether or not to resume OENCO training was needed by summer of
1980.

Purpose of Research

In response to a Human Resource Need (HRN) issued by the Office of the
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER), the Army Research Institute
(ARI) initiated an evaluation of the OENCO pilot program.   The intent of
this assessment was to describe the pilot program as it was currently being
implemented and to determine the effectiveness of the program in order to
provide input into decisions concerning the training and utilization of
OENCOs.

The Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER) specified three general objectives for the evaluation of the OENCO pilot program:

(1) To describe the current roles of OENCOs and to identify the factors related to OENCO utilization.

(2) To determine the role characteristics unique to the OENCO.

(3) To assess the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot program.

PROCEDURE

Rationale for Evaluation Procedure

As noted above, the results of this research were to provide information for decisions concerning the future training and utilization of OENCOs. The researchers and the OE managers concluded that four groups of people should be contacted for information. These groups, described in more detail in the following section, were: the OENCOs themselves, their OESO supervisors, their Key Managers, and commanders who had used OE. The survey instrument employed in the research would contain items relating to the three general objectives of the pilot program evaluation.

The first objective was to ascertain current OENCO roles and to identify factors bearing on OENCO utilization. No one knew whether, in the field, OENCOs functioned primarily as OE consultants or whether their primary role was one of trainer, or survey specialist, or some other role. Did OENCOs operate independently or only as adjuncts to the OESOs? What factors were important in determining what OENCOs did and how they did it?

Determining the role characteristics unique to the OENCO constituted the second objective. Were there certain characteristics of NCO status that made OENCOs more (or less) able to function in certain capacities? Was it easier for an OE-trained NCO to work with enlisted personnel and with other NCOs? Did this same NCO status hinder or help the OENCO in dealing with senior Army officers?

The third general objective of this research was to assess the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot program. There are, of course, several ways in which the effectiveness of such a program can be measured. One way is to expose a group to the training program and then compare them to an equivalent group which has not received the training. Any differences which occur between the two groups can then be attributed to the training, provided other factors such as work settings and supervision have been held constant. Such a "control group" approach, however, could not be implemented. Permitting a sizable group of untrained NCOs to do OE work was not a practical option, and to control factors such as work settings and supervision would have been difficult. Instead, it was decided to evaluate the performance of the OENCOs, their job satisfaction, the perceptions of others to the OENCOs, and the effects of OENCOs on the OE offices and on the supervisory responsibilities of the OESOs.

Sources of Information

To accomplish the evaluation, fo·r sources of information were tapped: OENCOs, OESOs, Key Managers[1] and OE users (commanders).

The OENCOs were graduates of Class 1-79 or OENCOs who had previously taken the officer course. (There were 47 of the former and six of the latter.) The OESOs were those most familiar with the work of the OENCOs. Key Managers were the persons in charge of the OE offices in which the OENCOs were located. The users were commanders who had contracted for OE operations in which OENCOs had participated.

Table 1 shows the number of respondents (OENCOs, OESOs, Key Managers, and OE users) broken out by major command (MACOM). It should be noted that any OESO or Key Manager who had more than one subordinate OENCO completed a separate questionnaire for each one.

Distribution of the questionnaires elicited reasonably good response rates from OENCOs (79%) and OESOs (73%). Only 53% of the Key Managers responded. We do not know what percentage of OE users responded since an unknown number of those questionnaires were distributed by the OESOs.

Questionnaires

ARI researchers generated questionnaire items after conferring with OEC&S staff, personnel engaged in OE work, and representatives from the Human Resources Development Directorate (HRDD) in the ODCSPER. A group of OESOs, OENCOs, and HRDD personnel reviewed these preliminary versions of the questionnaires. Input from reviewers provided the basis for revisions of the questionnaires. This process resulted in the following questionnaires:

OENCO Pilot Program - OENCO Questionnaire, August 1979 (PT5303a)

OENCO Pilot Program - OESO Questionnaire, August 1979 (PT5303b)

OENCO Pilot Program - Key Manager Questionnaire, August 1979 (PT5303c)

OENCO Pilot Program - Commander/OE User Questionnaire, August 1979 (PT5303d)

Most of the questionnaire items were in a multiple choice format, some required writing a number (such as a percentage), and the remainder were open-ended, write-in items. Appendix A contains copies of the questionnaires.

---

[1] A Key Manager is the individual who manages the efforts of the OESOs and who rates them.

Table 1

Number and Type of Questionnaire Respondents, by Major Command

Major Command	Respondents			
	OENCOs	OESOs	Key Mgrs	OE Users
FORSCOM	11	11	10	13
TRADOC	13	12	8	23
USAREUR	12	8	9	27
USAREC	3	4	4	9
WESTCOM	0	1	1	0
DARCOM	1	1	1	2
INSCOM	1	1	1	3
Totals	41 (79%)	38 (73%)	34 (53%)	77 [a]

[a]OESOs were requested to send Commander/OE User questionnaires to one or more OE users. The authors do not know how many questionnaires were actually distributed.

5

Distribution of Questionnaires

Questionnaires were sent to the OE office in each MACOM. MACOM offices then distributed a set of questionnaires to the OESO who was most familiar with the work of a given OENCO. For each OENCO, the following questionnaires were sent: one for the OENCO to complete, one for the OESO to complete, one for the Key Manager to complete, and three for OE users to complete. The OESO to whom the questionnaires were sent was tasked with distributing them to appropriate persons. Questionnaires were sent to MACOMS on 28 July 1979, and a cut-off date of mid-September was selected for returns.

Analyses

We report most of the results of this research in the form of frequencies or averages. As no equivalent comparison group was available, no statistical tests were conducted.

The results of the analyses are organized in terms of the three principal objectives of the research specified by the Army: (1) description of the OENCO role and factors associated with OENCO utilization, (2) role characteristics unique to the OENCO, and (3) determination of the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot program.

Description of the OENCO Role

This section contains information on OENCO and OESO views of the OENCO role and the amount of time OENCOs spend on OE activities. Also described are the specific tasks OENCOs perform, as well as the operations in which they participate.

Ranking of OE roles. OESOs and OENCOs were queried about the roles OENCOs performed. OESOs were also asked which roles they themselves performed. (The roles were: OE Consultant, Assistant OESO, Trainer, Instructor, Administrator, and Survey Specialist.) Respondents rank-ordered the set of role titles, using "1" for the role most frequently performed, "2" for the role next most frequently performed, and so on. Table 2 shows the average (mean) rankings of OENCO roles as judged by OENCOs, the OESO rankings of the roles they expected OENCOs to perform, and the roles OESOs felt OENCOs actually performed. In general, there is close correspondence between the OENCOs' and OESOs' views of the OENCO role. "OE Consultant," "Assistant OESO," and "Trainer" are the roles most highly ranked by both OENCOs and OESOs. There is also close correspondence between what the OESO expected the OENCO role to be and the actual OENCO role. Note that these rankings were made after the OENCO had been on the job for a relatively short period of time. Follow-up research will determine whether or not these rankings remain constant over a period of time.

These results are very similar to those obtained in a survey of OESO perceptions of the OE program. Oliver (1980) asked OESO respondents who had OENCOs in their offices what the OENCOs did. More than three-fourths of the respondents said the OENCO did the same things that an OESO did. Some of the other respondents reported that the OENCO functioned as an assistant to the OESO or as a trainer or did interviewing. (These data were collected very soon after the OENCO reported for duty; some OENCOs had not yet arrived.)

Table 2

Average Ranking of OENCO Role by OENCOs and OESOs

	Respondents' Rankings		
Role Title	OENCO (N = 41)	OESO (Actual) (N = 38)	OESO (Expected) (N = 34)
OE Consultant	1.90	2.03	1.56
Assistant OESO	3.15	2.21	2.12
Trainer	3.46	3.53	3.47
Instructor	4.05	4.61	4.65
Administrator	4.39	4.11	4.59
Survey Specialist	4.68	4.68	4.71
Other	5.88	6.47	6.56

NOTE: Roles were rank-ordered by frequency of performance, with "1" for the role most frequently performed.

Proportion of time spent on OE activities. Both OENCOs and OESOs were asked what proportion of the OENCOs' on-duty time was spent on activities related to OE and on activities not related to OE during the previous three months. The results are shown in Table 3

Table 3

Average Percent of OENCO's Time Spent on OE and Non-OE Activities

Respondent	OE Activities	Non-OE Activities
OENCO (N = 41)	85%	15%
OESO (N = 38)	84%	16%

The distributions of OE and non-OE time reported by OENCOs and OESOs were almost identical. The results suggest that OENCOs have been assimilated into OE work and not diverted to non-OE activities to any great extent.

Tasks performed by OENCOs. OENCO and OESO respondents indicated which five of a set of given tasks were most frequently and least frequently performed by the OENCO. Table 4 contains the list of tasks and the percentages of OENCOs and OESOs who rated each task as most and least frequently performed. Although OENCOs and OESOs generally agreed on which tasks were most frequently and least frequently performed, the two groups of respondents did differ in their perceptions of some of the tasks. OENCOs and OESOs agreed that interviewing, assessment analysis, and conducting workshops were among the five most frequent OENCO tasks. And both groups agreed that documentation was the least frequently performed OENCO task. Sizable discrepancies between OENCOs and OESOs concerned training, which was considered most frequent by 47% of OESOs and by 25% of OENCOs, and scouting and entry, rated most frequent by 47% of OESOs and by 22% of OENCOs. The two groups also assessed marketing differently--21% of OESOs and 38% of OENCOs rated it most frequent.

In addition to comparing OENCO and OESO responses regarding OENCO tasks, it is interesting to look at the "most frequent" ratings by OENCOs and OESOs of their own tasks. As can be seen in Table 5, the pattern of tasks is generally similar for both OENCOs and OESOs, although some differences did emerge. For example, a considerably higher percentage of OESOs than OENCOs rated conducting workshops and meetings, designing implementations, and scouting and entry as "most frequent." OENCOs, on the other hand, appeared to do proportionately more interviewing than the OESOs. As previously noted, the OENCOs had been in their jobs only three or four months at the time of this data collection. Thus, it remains for subsequent research to determine whether this pattern results from the short time on the job by the OENCOs or whether it is the normal OESO-OENCO distribution of labor.

Table 4

OENCO Tasks Most Frequently and Least Frequently Performed
as Rated by OENCOs and OESOs

Type of Task	Ratings of Task			
	Most Frequent		Least Frequent	
	OENCO (N = 40)	OESO (N = 38)	OENCO (N = 40)	OESO (N = 38)
Interviewing individuals/groups	82%	76%	0%	8%
Giving organizational feedback	52%	42%	8%	10%
Assessment analysis	50%	45%	2%	16%
Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	45%	60%	25%	10%
Process observation	42%	42%	2%	5%
Designing implementations	42%	42%	10%	13%
Marketing OE	38%	21%	15%	29%
Training	25%	47%	48%	24%
Scouting and entry	22%	47%	12%	8%
Preparing, administering, interpreting questionnaires	20%	24%	42%	26%
Routine OE-related administration	15%	21%	22%	16%
Reviewing literature for OE ideas	12%	13%	18%	18%
Team building with OE personnel	12%	10%	28%	10%
Collecting historical data	10%	8%	60%	56%
Evaluation of operations	10%	5%	50%	63%
Professional development activities	10%	13%	28%	40%
Routine organizational tasks	2%	10%	68%	58%
Documentation	0%	3%	70%	76%

Table 5

Comparison of OENCO and OESO Reports of
Their Own Most Frequently Performed Tasks

Type of Task	Rating of Task as "Most Frequent"	
	OENCO (N = 40)	OESO (N = 38)
Interviewing individuals/groups	82%	66%
Giving organizational feedback	52%	45%
Assessment analysis	50%	50%
Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	45%	74%
Process observation	42%	32%
Designing implementations	42%	74%
Marketing OE	38%	32%
Training	25%	13%
Scouting and entry	22%	50%
Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires	20%	16%
Routine OE-related administration	15%	21%
Reviewing literature for OE ideas	12%	5%
Team building with OE personnel	12%	10%
Collecting historical data	10%	0%
Evaluation of operations	10%	5%
Professional development activities	10%	8%
Routine organizational tasks	2%	3%
Documentation	0%	18%

Operations participated in by OENCOs. The OE users who returned question-naires reported the types of OE operations in which OENCOs had been encountered. Some OE users listed several types of operations in which OENCOs had partici-pated; others listed none. Table 6 provides a summary of what OENCOs did as reported by OE users. The operations given in Table 6 may not necessarily be representative of OENCO activities. The activities of these OENCOs may change as the OENCOs become more experienced. Also, note the OESO (perhaps in con-sultation with the OENCO) selected the persons to whom the OE user question-naires were distributed. Thus, the OE users were not a randomly selected group.

As shown in Table 6, the three types of operations in which OENCOs participated most frequently were (1) Command Transition Workshop, (2) Survey Feedback, and (3) Leadership and Management Development Course (LMDC). These operations were also among the half-dozen or so most frequently reported by OESOs in an investigation of OESO perceptions of the CE Program by Oliver (1980). These operations all require face-to-face interaction with OE users and the exercise of social skills either in front of groups or on a one-to-one basis. In general, these results are consistent with the OENCOs' reports of their most and least frequent activities reported above. Although the data do not reveal the extent of the OENCO's participation in these opera-tions, it appears that the new OENCOs were quickly integrated into some OE tasks in which personal visibility was high and their credibility was at stake.

Support and planning for OENCOs. Two factors which bear on OENCO utili-zation are the degree to which an OE office wanted an OENCO in the first place and the preparations made to fit the OENCO into the local OE organization.

Table 7 summarizes the responses of 38 OESOs to some of the questions concerning their support for an OENCO. Almost all the OE offices to which OENCOs were assigned had been consulted about the assignment, wanted the OENCO, and had had specific expectations concerning the OENCO's role.

Table 8 shows the actions taken by Key Managers and OESOs to enhance the utilization of OENCOs assigned to their OE offices. It is evident from Table 8 that Key Managers and OESOs were generally active in supporting the integration of OENCOs into their OE offices. The high percentage (92%) of OESOs who reported "involving the OENCO in an operation for training purposes" suggests that the OESOs were following up on the need of OENCOs for practical training experience. A number of the respondents answering "Other" stated that they had also obtained clients for the OENCO to support his or her tran-sition into the OE position.

Table 6

Frequency of OE Operations
in which OENCO Participated as Reported by OE Users

Type of Operation	Frequency of Use	
	N	Percent
Command Transition Workshop	20	29%
Survey Feedback	16	24%
Leadership & Management Development Course	7	10%
Teambuilding	4	6%
Survey (activity not specified)	3	4%
Conference Facilitation	3	4%
Four Step Process (Complete)	2	3%
Interview Feedback	2	3%
Specialized Workshop	2	3%
Workshop (title not specified)	2	3%
Workshop Follow-up	2	3%
Role Clarification	·1	2%
Survey Development	1	2%
Action Planning	1	2%
Problem Solving	1	2%
Stress Management	1	2%

Table 7

OESO Responses to Questions
Concerning Support and Planning for OENCO

| Questions | OESO Responses | (N = 38) | |
	Yes	No	Don't Know
Was your OE office consulted regarding the assignment of an OENCO before the assignment was made?	90%	5%	5%
Did your OE office request the assignment of an OENCO?	92%	5%	3%
Was the OENCO assigned to you in lieu of other personnel that you had requested?	8%	92%	0%
Before your OENCO arrived, did you have specific expectations about the role he/she would perform in your OE office and operations?	90%	2%	8%

Table 8

Actions Reported by Key Managers and OESOs to
Enhance OENCO Utilization

Type of Action	Affirmative Responses	
	Key Managers (N=34)	OESOs (N=37)
Thinking about the role the OENCO should play in our OE office	85%	92%
Notifying unit commanders of the addition of the OENCO to the OE staff	68%	44%
Introducing OENCO to current clients	N/A	87%
Involving the OENCO in an operation for training purposes	N/A	92%
Conducting team building within the OE office with the OENCO	N/A	78%
Scheduling professional development activities for the OENCO	N/A	51%
Directing the OESOs to prepare for the reception of the OENCO into the OE office	59%	N/A
Arranging clerical support for the OENCO	27%	46%
Arranging for appropriate work space for the OENCO	59%	92%
Providing necessary funding support	35%	67%
Other	21%	19%

Synopsis of OENCO role. In general, OENCOs and OESOs agree as to which tasks the OENCO performs most frequently (e.g., interviewing, assessment analysis, conducting workshops and meetings) and least frequently (documentation). While OENCOs and OESOs apparently do many of the same things, the emphasis differs somewhat for the two groups. OESOs appear to accomplish more of the initial contacts (scouting, entry) and to do more actual planning (designing implementations). OENCOs seem to do more implementation and collecting of information (interviewing, observing). More than half the client-reported operations involved command transitions and survey feedback. OE offices generally wanted an OENCO assigned to them, and both Key Managers and OESOs were active in planning for the integration of the OENCOs into the OE teams.

OENCO Role Characteristics

In assessing the contribution of OENCOs to the OE effort, it is of interest to determine what the special competencies of OENCOs are and how the OENCO contribution complements that of the OESO. Also of interest are the managers' and supervisors' preferred ratio of OENCOs to OESOs and the type of additional OE personnel the managers and supervisors would prefer.

OENCO competencies as seen by OESOs. Table 9 summarizes the responses of OESOs to questions about the competencies of the OENCOs. OESOs were asked to indicate five tasks for which their confidence in their OENCOs' abilities was highest and five tasks for which their confidence was lowest. The five tasks for which OESOs expressed greatest confidence in their OENCOs' abilities were: conducting workshops and meetings, interviewing, training, assessment analysis, and giving organizational feedback. Note that these tasks are typical of OE consultant activities and that they are frequently performed by both OENCOs and OESOs (see Table 5). The tasks OESOs reported they had least confidence in their OENCOs' abilities to perform were documentation and evaluation. Since these tasks are infrequently performed by OENCOs (Table 4), OESOs would have observed their performance much less frequently. In general, then, OESOs had highest confidence in their OENCOs' abilities with respect to tasks frequently performed and lowest confidence for tasks infrequently performed. While infrequently performed tasks could be those OENCOs do not perform well (and hence are not assigned to), it seems more likely that they are lower priority tasks which typically tend to be performed infrequently by OE personnel and thus were not observed sufficiently to establish confidence.

OENCO special attributes as reported by OENCOs. OENCOs were asked, in an open-ended item, to list special skills or competencies they had that the local OESOs did not have. Table 10 summarizes the 30 different responses that were made. (Five persons answered "None" or felt they had inadequate comparative data.)

Table 9

Number of OESOs Reporting Highest and Lowest Degree
of Confidence in OENCO Ability to Perform Task

Task	Number of OESOs Indicating Confidence in OENCO	
	Highest (N = 38)	Lowest (N = 38)
Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	22	5
Interviewing individuals/groups	19	1
Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	19	3
Assessment analyses	16	7
Giving organizational feedback	15	4
Marketing OE	13	7
Designing implementation (e.g., workshops, transition meetings)	13	9
Process observation	10	4
Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	10	9
Team building with OE personnel	8	2
Routine OE-related administration	7	7
Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	7	17
Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	6	7
Reviewing literature for OE ideas	5	5
Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	4	21
Professional development activities	1	8
Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	0	22
Documentation (time, costs, tracking your operations)	0	24

Table 10

Number and Percent of OENCO Respondents Enumerating
Special OENCO Attributes

	OENCO Respondents	
	N	Percent
Experience/training/education	14	30
Deal better with enlisted/NCOs	12	26
Personal characteristics	11	24
Deal better with commanders/managers	4	9
Different perspective	4	9
Miscellaneous	1	2

As can be seen above, almost one-third of the reasons related to the OENCOs'
different experience/training/education. This category included responses
which indicated that the OENCOs had been exposed to a somewhat different
curriculum at OEC&S than had the OESOs who had graduated earlier. Specific-
ally mentioned by OENCOs were greater expertise in GOQ administration, cost-
benefit analysis, and evaluation in general. Several OENCOs also mentioned
other training or education which was not received at OEC&S. Twelve NCOs
(26%) stated that they deal better with or interact more effectively with
other NCOs or enlisted personnel. As one respondent stated: "I feel that
I have gained the trust of the lower ranks when I have been involved (with)
interviewing or giving the GOQ. Enlisted people have told me they were more
open and honest with me than they would be with an officer. Whoever that
officer might be, not only the OESOs here at Fort _____." Personal
characteristics mentioned by the OENCOs included being more people-oriented,
being a better listener, doing more "gut-feeling processing," having greater
humility, more guts, greater dedication, and more common sense. Nine percent
stated that they deal better with commanders and/or managers and 9% also stated
that they have a different perspective than the OESOs. In sum, although some
reasons given (e.g., personal characteristics) were not associated with NCO
status, the large majority of responses to this item were related to the
special background and experiences OENCOs possess as a result of their NCO
status. Many of the respondents stressed the assets of a mature NCO who has
a unique perspective derived from long Army experience and an understanding
of the enlisted environment.

    OENCO contributions to OE effort. A series of questions presented to
Key Managers and OESOs assesses how the assignment of an OENCO adds to the
operational capability of an OE office. Results are shown in Table 11.
These findings show that the major impact of the OENCO is to enable the OE
office to increase the volume of work performed--i.e., to do more for each

Table 11

Ratings by OESOs and Key Managers of OENCO Contributions to OE Effort

Contribution of OENCO	Ratings		
	Has Had Negligible Effect	Has Had Some Effect	Has Had Substantial Effect
Responses of Key Managers (N = 34)			
Enables us to do more for each operation.	6%	29%	65%
Enables the OE office to serve more clients in a given period of time.	3%	21%	77%
Increases ability to get good info from enlisted personnel.	6%	21%	74%
Enhances credibility of OE within the command.	12%	36%	52%
Enables the OE office to conduct different types of operations than we did before.	12%	58%	30%
Provides access to different set of people than before.	9%	52%	39%
Facilitates routine staff work.	39%	39%	21%
Responses of OESOs (N = 38)			
Provides "extra pair of hands" for the OESO(s).	3%	16%	82%
Enables us to do more for each operation.	0%	21%	79%
Enables us to serve more clients in a given period of time.	3%	16%	82%
Increases our ability to get good info from enlisted personnel.	0%	34%	66%
Increases our credibility with commanders and NCOs.	10%	37%	53%
Enables us to conduct different types of operations than we did before.	58%	24%	18%
Provides access to different set of people than before.	26%	34%	40%
Facilitates routine staff work.	26%	45%	29%

19

operation and to serve more clients. In addition, the OENCO is seen as increasing "the ability to get good information from enlisted personnel" and enhancing the "credibility of OE within the command." The OENCO appears to have less impact on facilitating routine staff work. In general, both OESOs and OENCOs agree that the OENCO has had a positive effect on the work of the OE office.

Levels of effective functioning. There is a possibility that OENCOs may be less effective than their officer counterparts in some areas. One such area may be the higher echelons of command. Accordingly, OENCOs, OESOs, and Key Managers were asked to what extent (on a five-point scale ranging from "Almost Never" to "Almost Always") the OENCO could function effectively at various organizational levels. Table 12 summarizes the responses on this question by reporting the percentages of OENCOs, OESOs, and Key Managers who responded "Usually" or "Almost Always" to the pertinent items.

Table 12

Percentages of OENCOs, OESOs, and Key Managers Responding
that OENCOs Could Function Effectively at Various
Organizational Levels "Usually" or "Almost Always"

Organizational Level	Respondent Group		
	OENCO (N = 41)	OESO (N = 38)	Key Manager (N = 34)
Company level	83%	97%	76%
Battalion level	80%	79%	88%
Brigade level	88%	68%	76%
Installation/Division level	82%	62%	79%
MACOM level	75%	56%	61%

In general, all three groups of respondents saw the OENCO functioning more effectively at lower than at higher organizational levels. The OESO responses show this pattern clearly. A substantially larger proportion of Key Managers, however, believed OENCOs could function effectively "Usually" or "Almost Always" at the battalion level (88%) than at the company level (76%). Also, more OENCOs gave positive responses for brigade level functioning than for company (83%) or battalion (80%) levels, although these differences were not great.

20

Ratio of OENCOs to OESOs. Key Managers and OESOs were asked to indicate what they thought the proper ratio of OENCOs to OESOs should be. The responses to this question are summarized in Table 13. The table shows the most preferred ratio was "One OENCO for one OESO," a response which was selected by 52% of Key Managers and 41% of OESOs. The "One OENCO for one OESO" response was also frequently chosen (21% of Key Managers and 30% of OESOs).

Table 13

Number and Percent of Key Managers and OESOs
Indicating Preferred Ratios of OENCOs to OESOs

Preferred Ratio	Respondents	
	Key Managers (N = 33)	OESOs (N = 37)
1 OENCO for 6 or more OESOs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
1 OENCO for 4 or 5 OESOs	1 (3%)	4 (11%)
1 OENCO for 2 or 3 OESOs	17 (52%)	15 (41%)
1 OENCO for 1 OESO	7 (21%)	11 (30%)
2 or 3 OENCOs for 1 OESO	4 (12%)	7 (19%)
4 or 5 OENCOs for 1 OESO	4 (12%)	0 (0%)
6 or more OENCOs for 1 OESO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Preference for type of OE personnel. Key Managers and OESOs were asked about their preferences for additional OE personnel, and Table 14 summarizes these preferences. Fifteen write-in responses for this item were classified as "Both or Either," "Neither/O.K. as is," or "Civilian," and these responses are included in the table.

Table 14

Preferences of Key Managers and OESOs for Additional OE Personnel

Type of OE Personnel	Respondents	
	Key Managers (N = 33)	OESOs (N = 37)
Another OESO	15 (45%)	19 (51%)
Another OENCO	9 (27%)	10 (27%)
Both or either	5 (15%)	5 (14%)
Neither/O.K. as is	3 (9%)	1 (3%)
Civilian	1 (3%)	2 (5%)

The table shows that the most frequent preference was for another OESO. This finding is in line with the preferred ratio results discussed above. Ten respondents (five Key Managers and five OESOs) indicated no preference by responding "Both" or "Either." Four people said "Neither" or indicated they already had sufficient OE personnel, while three respondents indicated a preference for civilians.

When asked to give a reason for their preferences for an OENCO or OESO, many respondents indicated that they wanted one or the other because they were "short" that type of person. If they had substantially more OESOs than OENCOs, for example, the Key Managers and OESOs preferred another OENCO. A number of respondents commented that they liked to have an OENCO and an OESO work together as a team. Often, the choice for an additional OE person tended to be related to the specific environment in which the OE effort took place. Some locations require greater involvement with enlisted personnel or civilians. In these cases, OENCOs or OE-trained civilians were preferred. Sometimes respondents expressed a preference for an OESO because of the high level of the command. Attitudes of the command group were also influential, as illustrated by the comment of a Key Manager who wrote that there was a "...reluctance on the part of the senior leadership (06 to 09) to place the same degree of confidence in the OENCO that is placed in the OESO."

Synopsis of role characteristics: OENCOs seem to have developed competencies similar to those of OESOs. Since OENCOs and OESOs receive similar training, this result is not surprising. In addition to general competencies, OENCOs also have special attributes which are often related to their status as NCOs. The most salient of these attributes relates to dealing more comfortably and effectively with other NCOs and with enlisted personnel. And while OENCOs are

most definitely seen as capable of operating effectively at lower organizational levels, a firm majority of OESOs and Key Managers (as well as the OENCOs themselves) view OENCOs as also capable of functioning at the highest organizational levels. Preferences of the OE managers and supervisors are for two OESOs for each OENCO, or for equal numbers of OESOs and OENCOs. Preferences of these same people for additional OE personnel do not seem to be related to preferences for OENCOs or OESOs as such. Rather, their preferences are determined by the specific environment, such as an OENCO-OESO imbalance, a large proportion of enlisted or civilian personnel, or the organizational level of the OE users.

Effectiveness of Pilot Program

The third major question this investigation sought to answer concerned the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot programs. In the following sections, we consider the following measures of effectiveness: the degree to which OENCOs fulfilled the expectations their OE offices had for them, ratings of overall OENCO competence, reactions of OE users to OENCOs, some quantitative effects on the functioning of OE offices, the job satisfaction of OENCOs themselves, and acceptance of OENCOs into the OE effort. Another aspect of program effectiveness is the demonstration that OESOs perceive their added supervisory responsibilities in a positive fashion.

Expectations for OENCOs. OESOs were queried regarding the extent to which OENCOs had lived up to their expectations. Of 38 OESO respondents, 17 (45%) said OENCOs had exceeded their expectations; 15 (40%) reported they had fully met their expectations; and 6 (16%) said OENCOs had not quite lived up to their expectations. OENCOs, then, had fully met or even exceeded the expectations of 85% of the OESOs.

Ratings of OENCO competence. Ratings of OENCO competence were obtained from OENCOs, OE users, and OESOs. These ratings were "global"--i.e., they were ratings of the OENCO's overall competence rather than separate ratings of various aspects of competence. Table 15 presents the competence ratings made by OENCOs and OE users.

Of the OENCOs, 90% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "I think my overall job performance as an OENCO has been excellent." Of the OE users who responded, 98% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "My impression of this OENCO's overall competence is highly positive." Only two (less than 3%) of the 77 OE users responded that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. OE users were even more strongly positive toward OENCOs than were OENCOs themselves; the average (mean) ratings of OENCO competence on the five-point scale were 4.38 by the OENCOs and 4.70 by the OE users.

Table 15

Ratings of OENCO Overall Competence
by OENCOs and OE Users

Respondent (Competence Statement)	N	Respondents Making Rating				
		Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
OENCO ("I think my overall job performance as an OENCO has been excellent.")	40	0%	3%	8%	40%	50%
OE User ("My impression of this OENCO's overall competence is highly positive.")	77	0%	0%	3%	25%	73%

Table 16 shows OESOs' ratings of OENCO competence. Again, ratings of OENCO competence were overwhelmingly favorable, with 92% of the 38 OESOs responding "Good," "Very Good," or "Excellent" to the question, "What has been your impression of this OENCO's overall competence?" The average (mean) rating of OENCO competence by OESOs was 4.37. Note that these ratings, although also on a five-point scale, were on a scale which did not contain a neutral midpoint as did the rating scale used by the OENCOs and OE users. Instead, the ratings by the OESOs had a midpoint of "Good." This difference between the two scales should be kept in mind in considering results. In addition to their positive responses on the competence item, OESOs indicated by write-in responses that they view the OENCOs in the pilot program (with two or three exceptions) as outstanding individuals. Some OESOs (and Key Managers) stated they felt it was important to the program to select highly competent NCOs.

Table 16

Ratings of OENCO Overall Competence
by OESOs

Rating (Scale Value)	OESOs Making Rating (N = 38)
Poor (1)	3%
Fair (2)	5%
Good (3)	10%
Very Good (4)	16%
Excellent (5)	66%

Quantitative measures of OE office productivity. Although the OENCOs had been on the job for only three or four months, their supervisory OESOs were asked to provide some "hard data" concerning the effect of the OENCOs on the productivity of the OE offices. (OESOs were asked to use records data wherever possible.) Of the 38 OESOs who returned questionnaires, 30 were able to supply such data for the periods of three months before and three months after the assignment of their OENCOs. These results are shown in Table 17. Improvement in every category can be noted. In particular, OENCOs appeared to have a substantial impact on the volume of work done by OE offices (e.g., 35% more operations and 30% more clients). Several caveats are attached to these results: the short time on the job by the OENCO, personnel turbulence within the OE office, personnel turbulence among the OE users, etc. The extent to which these various factors influenced the results has not been determined.

OENCO acceptance and integration into OE team. Table 18 summarizes the responses of OENCOs and OE users to questionnaire items related to the acceptance of OENCOs and their integration into the OE team. For most items, close to 90% of the respondents answered that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Although there were a few instances (two or three people in the entire group) of disagreement with the statements, the overall picture is of widespread OENCO acceptance with the OENCO well integrated into the OE team effort.

Satisfaction of OE users. Table 19 depicts the satisfaction of OE users with OE operations and with OENCO participation in the OE operations in question. OE users were very positive toward OE, with 96% of the users agreeing that they would probably use OE in the future. With respect to OENCOs themselves, OE users were even more highly positive--the percentages in the "Strongly Agree" column are even higher for the items concerning OENCOs than they are for those pertaining to OE. None of the respondents disagreed with any of the statements, as indicated by only "0%" entries in the first two columns. Since OE offices decided to whom the OE user questionnaires were to be sent, it is likely that commanders receiving the questionnaire were those involved in OE operations that had gone at least reasonably well. It is noteworthy, however, that this favorable OE user reaction was obtained after the OENCOs had been on their jobs a relatively short time (about three or four months) and that they had not had the field experience normally given to OESOs. Evidently OENCOs were able to move quickly into their new roles, acquire on-the-job training not obtained through the OENCO course, and make a highly favorable impression on OE users with whom they worked.

Table 17

Average OESO Estimates of Quantitative Measures of OE Office
Productivity Before and After OENCO Assignment

	Time Period	
Measure	For the three months before OENCO's arrival	For the past three months (with OENCO assigned)
How many separate OE operations did your OE office conduct?	8.31	11.21
For how many different clients?	7.3	9.41
On the average, how many weeks did a client wait from the time of request for OE services until action was initiated?	4.1	2.91
On the average, how many calendar days did it take for your OE office to conduct the agreed-upon OE operation?	22.31	20.81
What percent of their on-duty time did OESOs at your location spend on work "billable" to clients? (Work which is billable to a client involves all the preparation, direct contact, analysis, report writing, etc., such as a management consultant would charge for.)	60.41%	64.81%
What percent of their on-duty time did OESOs at your location spend on OE mission-related work not considered billable to clients? (Include professional development, research, etc.)	24.0 %	22.8 %

Table 18

Percentages of OENCOs and OE Users Responding to
Questions Concerning OENCO Acceptance and
Integration into OE Team

Item	Responses				
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Disagree nor Agree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
OENCO Responses (N = 41)					
Commanders/OE users have received me very well.	2%	2%	5%	44%	46%
I have been favorably received by those of equal or lower rank with whom I associate (formal and informal associations).	0%	5%	7%	34%	54%
I work very well with the OESO(s) here.	2%	5%	10%	15%	68%
I work very well with the Key Manager.	0%	0%	24%	32%	44%
This OE office functions effectively as a team.	2%	5%	7%	29%	56%
I have been fully integrated into the OE team here.	0%	2%	10%	17%	71%
OE User Responses (N = 77)					
This OENCO and the OESO(s) work very well together as a team.	0%	0%	7%	17%	76%

Table 19

Satisfaction of OE Users with OE and
with OENCO Participation in OE Operations

Item	Responses of OE Users (N = 77)				
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The effect of recent OE operations on my unit/organization has been highly positive.	0%	0%	4%	47%	49%
There is a high probability that my unit/organization will request OE services in the future.	0%	0%	4%	35%	61%
The effect of this OENCO on the OE operation(s) in question was highly positive.	0%	0%	1%	42%	57%
I would like to have this OENCO participate in future OE operations in my unit/organizations.	0%	0%	1%	21%	78%

Job satisfaction of OENCO. Table 20 contains seven items from the OENCO questionnaire which relate to various aspects of OENCO job satisfaction. It is apparent that OENCOs were generally very satisfied with their OE jobs. Approximately 90% of the OENCOs felt that their work was personally satisfying, that they were using their OE skills effectively and increasing their competence, that they were making a contribution to the user organization, and that their job requirements were clear. Some 80% of the respondents felt that the organizational climate allowed them to use their OE capabilities effectively and expressed a desire for OE assignments in future tours.

Table 20

Job Satisfaction of OENCOs

Item	Responses of OENCOs (N = 41)				
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
My work here is personally satisfying.	0%	5%	5%	32%	58%
I am using my OE skills in a highly effective manner.	0%	5%	8%	45%	42%
I feel that what I do as an OENCO improves the user organization.	0%	7%	2%	34%	56%
This assignment has increased my competence as a soldier.	0%	5%	5%	29%	61%
I'm not sure what is required of me in my present assignment.	63%	2%	29%	5%	0%
The climate in which I work allows me to use my abilities and knowledge of OE in an effective manner.	5%	10%	5%	35%	45%
I would like to be assigned in the OENCO program during subsequent tours.	0%	15%	5%	9%	71%

Changes in managerial/supervisory requirements for OESOs. OESOs were also asked how managerial/supervisory requirements associated with having OENCOs in their offices had affected their roles as OESOs. Of the 36 responses to this question, 26 (72%) could be classified as "no or negligible effect." Four persons mentioned it took time to supervise the training needed by their OENCOs (but two of these respondents emphasized the set-up should not be changed). Five persons gave miscellaneous comments concerning positive effects of the OENCOs on their OESO roles. Only one had a strongly negative response, stating that an inordinate amount of time was needed for training, checking the OENCO's work, and correcting errors. Many OESOs, though, reflected the attitude of the OESO who stated: "The supervisory requirements have been minimal since the OENCO performs as a partner more than as a subordinate."

Table 21

Factors Considered by OESOs to
Be Most Important to OENCO Competency

Factor	Number of Times Factor Mentioned
Experience/education	
Army experience	28
Education	7
Skills	
Verbal skills	20
Writing skills	5
Interpersonal skills	8
OE skills	15
Miscellaneous	4
Personal characteristics	
Maturity/integrity	5
Appearance	8
Self-confidence	7
Miscellaneous	14
Organizational Support	
Local support	7
High command support	2
Level not specified	1

Factors important to OENCO competency. OESOs were asked what factors
are most important to OENCO competency. A summary of the responses to this
open-ended item is contained in Table 21. The factors are grouped in o four
general categories: experience/education, skills, personal characteristics,
and organizational support. The most frequently cited factor was Army expe-
rience (28 mentions), which included Army service in general plus specific
experiences such as recruiter, combat arms expertise, squad leader/platoon
sergeant, senior NCO, etc. Four of the Army experience responses were vari-
ants on "not the equal opportunity type." Verbal skills was the next most
frequently occurring factor (20 mentions) with OE skills (in general or
specific skills such as facilitation) also frequently noted (20 mentions).
Although less often mentioned (eight times), the factor of interpersonal
skills was considered important. Positive personal characteristics were

also considered important with appearance cited eight times. The 13 personal characteristics classified as "miscellaneous" included a variety of traits such as high achievement motivation, mental toughness, enthusiasm, dedication to the Army, flexibility, guts, and positive expectations. Organizational support of some type accounted for 10 responses, with local support cited seven times, high command support twice, and support of unspecified level noted once. Note that the factors mentioned, with the exception of OE skills and organizational support, tend to be characteristics or background which OENCOs acquire before obtaining their OE training.

Synopsis of pilot program effectiveness: All factors related to the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot program indicate that it is, in fact, effective. The expectations held by the OE office for the OENCO have been fulfilled. The OENCOs see themselves as competent, and this view is shared by their OESOs and by commanders using OE. The productivity of OE offices, although affected by turbulence, appears to have increased since the arrival of the OENCOs. Commanders who use OE are very satisfied and feel OENCOs contribute positively to OE operations. In addition, the job satisfaction of OENCOs is high, they are well accepted, and they appear to be well integrated into the OE team effort. Further, the managerial/supervisory requirements for OESOs are generally unaffected or increased to a negligible extent. The three factors considered by OESOs to be most important in producing competent OENCOs are Army experience, verbal skills, and OE skills.

CONCLUSIONS

With respect to the conclusions presented below, several considerations should be kept in mind. First, the findings of this report are based entirely on survey data, and the respondents do not represent the entire populations of OENCOs, OESO supervisors, Key Managers, and OE users. In add..ion, most of the OENCOs have been on their jobs only three or four months.

1. <u>Current roles of OENCOs</u>. For the most part, OENCOs play much the same role as do OESOs. Although the activities of OESOs and OENCOs appear to be similar, there do seem to be some differences of emphasis. OESOs spend more of their time making initial contacts and planning, whereas OENCOs spend more of their time collecting information and performing implementations.

2. <u>Unique role characteristics</u>. Although OENCOs have competencies similar to those of OESOs, they also have some unique characteristics because of their enlisted status. As senior enlisted persons (often with longer Army experience), OENCOs bring a different perspective to the OE effort and may be more effective and credible than officers in dealing with enlisted personnel. OENCOs may also function more effectively at lower rather than at higher organizational levels.

3. <u>Effectiveness of pilot program</u>. All measures of effectiveness used to assess this pilot program indicate that the program has been highly successful in producing competent OE people who make significant contributions to the OE effort early in their first OE assignments.

4. <u>Reliability of data</u>. There was strong agreement in the responses of four different groups of respondents. This high degree of consistency suggests that the data are quite reliable and gives us more confidence in the results.

5. <u>Selection criteria</u>. OENCOs in this pilot program were generally viewed (with two or three exceptions) as outstanding individuals. If the criteria for selection were altered, results might be different. The data suggest that it is not just the training the OENCOs receive or the roles they assume, but the character of the persons occupying those roles that assures the success of the program.

SUMMARY

Background:

A pilot program was established for training and utilizing noncommissioned officers (NCOs) in organizational effectiveness (OE) work in the Army. Two classes of approximately 45 NCOs each were trained at the Organizational Effectiveness Center and School (OEC&S) and placed in OE jobs throughout the Army. No more Organizational Effectiveness noncommissioned officers (OENCOs) were to be trained until the effectiveness of the program could be assessed. The Army Research Institute (ARI) was requested to evaluate the OENCO pilot program, and this report contains information on the first class (Class 1-79) participating in the pilot program. The objectives for the evaluation were: (1) to describe the current roles of OENCOs and to identify the factors related to OENCO utilization, (2) to determine the role characteristics unique to the OENCO, and (3) to assess the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot program.

Approach:

Questionnaires were distributed to the OENCOs in Class 1-79, their OESO supervisors, their Key Managers, and a sample of OE users (commanders who had contracted for OE operations in which the OENCO had participated). The questionnaires contained items which pertained to the three research objectives stated above. Questionnaires were returned by 41 OENCOs, 38 OESOs, 34 Key Managers, and 77 OE users.

Findings:

The findings are organized in terms of the three objectives of the research.

Description of OENCO role: In general, OENCOs and OESOs agree as to which tasks the OENCO performed most frequently (e.g., interviewing, assessment analysis, conducting workshops and meetings) and least frequently (documentation). While OENCOs and OESOs apparently do many of the same things, the emphasis differs somewhat for the two groups. OESOs appear to accomplish more of the initial contact (scouting, entry) and to do more actual planning (designing implementations). OENCOs seem to do more implementation and collecting of information (interviewing, observing). More than half the client-reported operations involved command transitions and survey feedback. OE offices generally wanted an OENCO assigned to them, and both Key Managers and OESOs were active in planning for the integration of the OENCOs into the OE teams.

Role characteristics unique to OENCO: OENCOs seem to have developed competencies similar to those of OESOs. Since OENCOs and OESOs receive similar training, this result is not surprising. In addition to general competencies, OENCOs also have special attributes which are often related to their status as NCOs. The most salient of these attributes related to dealing more comfortably and effectively with other NCOs and with enlisted pe sonnel. And while OENCOs are most definitely seen as capable of operating ef ectively at lower organizational levels, a firm majority of OESOs and Key Managers (as well as the OENCOs themselves) view OENCOs as also capable of functioning at the highest organizational levels. Preferences of the OE managers and supervisors are for two OESOs for each OENCO or for equal numbers of OESOs and OENCOs. Preferences of these same people for additional OE personnel do not seem to be related to preferences for OENCOs or OESOs as such. Rather, their preferences are determined by the specific environment, such as an OENCO-OESO imbalance, a large proportion of enlisted or civilian personnel, or the organizational level of the OE users.

Effectiveness of OENCO pilot program: All factors related to the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot program indicate that it is, in fact, effective. The expectations held by the OE office for the OENCO have been fulfilled. The OENCOs see themselves as competent, and this view is shared by their OESOs and by commanders using OE. The productivity of OE offices, although affected by turbulence, appears to have increased since the arrival of the OENCOs. Commanders who use OE are very satisfied and feel OENCOs contribute positively to OE operations. In addition, the job satisfaction of OENCOs is high, they are well accepted, and they appear to be well integrated into the OE team effort. Further, the managerial/supervisory requirements for OESOs are generally unaffected or increased to a negligible extent. The three factors considered by OESOs to be most important in producing competent OENCOs are Army experience, verbal skills, and OE skills.

Conclusions:

In considering the conclusions, several considerations should be kept in mind: the findings are based entirely on survey data; the respondents do not represent the entire populations of OENCOs, OESOs, Key Managers, and OE users; the OENCOs have been on their jobs a very short time; and the OENCOs constitute a group of superior NCOs.

1. OENCOs play an OE consultant role similar to the one OESOs play, but their activities have a somewhat different emphasis (more time spent collecting information and performing implementations).

2. As senior enlisted people, OENCOs bring a different perspective to the OE effort and may be more effective and credible than officers in dealing with enlisted personnel.

3. All measures of effectiveness used to assess this pilot program indicate the program has been highly successful.

4. The high degree of consistency of response across the four groups of respondents suggests that the results are highly reliable.

5. The positive results of the program appear to be due, at least in part, to the selection criteria used.

REFERENCES

Oliver, L. W. Organizational Effectiveness Staff Officer (OESO) perceptions
of the Army's Organizational Effectiveness (OE) Program. (ARI Research
Report). Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral
and Social Sciences, 1980. In process.

APPENDIX A-1

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - OENCO QUESTIONNAIRE

AUGUST 1979

US ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE

BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PT 5303a

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974
(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM	PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE
PT 5303a OENCO Pilot Program – OENCO Questionnaire	AR 70-1

1 AUTHORITY

10 USC Sec 4503

2. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S)

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

3 ROUTINE USES

This is an experimental personnel data collection form developed by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences pursuant to its research mission as prescribed in AR 70-1. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4 MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no effect on individuals for not providing all or any part of the information. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.

FORM	Privacy Act Statement · 26 Sep 75

DA Form 4368-R, 1 May 75

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM: OENCO QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This questionnaire is to be completed by all OENCOs
graduated from OETC/OECS in 1979. The purpose of this questionnaire
is to provide the Army with accurate feedback information about the
OENCO Pilot Program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence,
and your anonymity will be maintained. Reports based on this research
will not identify individuals or units. Names are requested only for
follow-up purposes. (Completed questionnaires should be mailed to the
Army Research Institute, ATTN: PERI-IM-B, Dr. Laurel Oliver, 5001
Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333, in the envelope provided for
this purpose.)

1.   Name: _____

2.   Mailing Address: _____

_____

_____

3.   Name of OESO most familiar with your work: _____

4.   Your rater (if different): _____

5.   Key Manager: _____

6.   Total number of OESOs in your OE office: _____   1:7,8

7.   Total number of OENCOs in your OE office (including yourself): _____   1:9,10

8.   MACOM: ___(1) FORSCOM   ___(6) USAREC

___(2) TRADOC   ___(7) MDW   1:11

___(3) USAREUR   ___(8) WESTCOM

___(4) INSCOM   ___(9) Other (please specify):

___(5) DARCOM   _____

During the past three months, please estimate the percent of your
on-duty time that you have spent on:

9.   ___% OE mission-related activities   1:12,13

10. ___% Activities not related to OE mission   1:14,15

OENCO-1

11. Sex: ___(1) Male

              ___(2) Female

12. Rank: ___(1) E-6   ___(4) E-9

              ___(2) E-7   ___(5) Other (please specify):

              ___(3) E-8   _____

13. PMOS: _____

14. Training: ___(1) OENCO Class 1-79

              ___(2) OENCO Class 2-79

              ___(3) OESO course

              ___(4) Other (please specify):

              _____

Rank the following titles according to how well they describe the role you
are actually performing. (Use "1" for that which best describes your role;
"2" for that which is next best; "3" for next best; and so on.)

15. ___ OE Consultant   16. ___ Assistant OESO

17. ___ Administrator   18. ___ Instructor

19. ___ Trainer   20. ___ Survey Specialist

21. ___ Other (please specify): _____

To what extent do you feel that, as an OENCO, you could function effectively
at the following levels? (Please circle the number corresponding to your
chosen response.)

		Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always	
22.	Company level	1	2	3	4	5	1:28
23.	Battalion level	1	2	3	4	5	1:29
24.	Brigade level	1	2	3	4	5	1:30
25.	Installation/Division level	1	2	3	4	5	1:31
26.	MACOM level	1	2	3	4	5	1:32

OENCO-2

Indicate the relative frequency with which you perform the OE tasks
listed below. Circle a "1" for the five tasks least frequently per-
formed. Circle a "3" for the five tasks most frequently performed.
Then circle a "2" for the remaining tasks.

		Least Frequent		Most Frequent	
27.	Marketing OE	1	2	3	1:33
28.	Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	1	2	3	1:34
29.	Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	1	2	3	1:35
30.	Interviewing individuals/groups	1	2	3	1:36
31.	Process observation	1	2	3	1:37
32.	Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	1	2	3	1:38
33.	Assessment analysis	1	2	3	1:39
34.	Giving organizational feedback	1	2	3	1:40
35.	Designing implementation (e.g., workshop, transition meeting)	1	2	3	1:41
36.	Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	1	2	3	1:42
37.	Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	1	2	3	1:43
38.	Documentation (time, costs, tracking your operations)	1	2	3	1:44
39.	Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	1	2	3	1:45
40.	Routine OE-related administration	1	2	3	1:46
41.	Reviewing literature for OE ideas	1	2	3	1:47
42.	Professional development activities	1	2	3	1:48
43.	Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	1	2	3	1:49
44.	Team building with OE personnel	1	2	3	1:50
45.	Other (please specify):				
	_____	1	2	3	1:51

OENCO-3

46. What percent of your OE-related duties require the training you
received at OETC/OECS?

___%

47. What specific skills and knowledge that you acquired at OETC/OECS
are not being used? Note reasons where possible. (Use back of
page if more space is needed.)

48. Describe below how you feel you can be most effectively used as
an OENCO. (Use back of page if more space is needed.)

49. Describe below what you feel is the least effective use of you
as an OENCO. (Use back of page if more space is needed.)

50. What special skills or competencies do you feel you have that your
local OESOs do not? (Use back of page if more space is needed.

51. How should the OENCO course be changed in order to provide more
effective training for OENCOs? (Use back of page if more space
is needed.)

OENCO-4

Indicate the extent of your agreement with the statements given below.
Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
52.	I feel that what I do as an OENCO improves the user organization.	1	2	3	4	5	1:54
53.	This assignment has increased my competence as a soldier.	1	2	3	4	5	1:55
54.	My work here is personally satisfying.	1	2	3	4	5	1:56
55.	I would like to be assigned in the OENCO program during subsequent tours.	1	2	3	4	5	1:57
56.	I'm not sure what is required of me in my present assignment.	1	2	3	4	5	1:58
57.	My training at OETC/ OECS prepared me well for the job here.	1	2	3	4	5	1:59
58.	I have been fully integrated into the OE team here.	1	2	3	4	5	1:60
59.	The preparations that were made to integrate me into the local organization and OE efforts were excellent.	1	2	3	4	5	1:61
60.	I am using my OE skills in a highly effective manner.	1	2	3	4	5	1:62
61.	I think my overall job performance as an OENCO has been excellent.	1	2	3	4	5	1:63

OENCO-5

5

Indicate the extent of your agreement with the statements given below.
Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
62. The climate in which I work allows me to use my abilities and knowledge of OE in an effective manner.	1	2	3	4	5	1:64
63. I work very well with the OESO(s) here.	1	2	3	4	5	1:65
64. I work very well with the Key Manager.	1	2	3	4	5	1:66
65. Commanders/OE users have received me very well.	1	2	3	4	5	1:67
66. This OE office functions effectively as a team.	1	2	3	4	5	1:68
67. I have been favorably received by those of equal or lower rank with whom I associate (formal and informal associations).	1	2	3	4	5	1:69

68. Please give us any additional information or comments you may have concerning your job as an OENCO.

OENCO-6

APPENDIX A-2

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - OESO QUESTIONNAIRE

AUGUST 1979

US ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE

BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PT 5303b

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974
(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM	PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE
PT 5303b OENCO Pilot Program - OESO Questionnaire	AR 70-1

1. AUTHORITY

10 USC Sec 4503

2. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S)

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

3. ROUTINE USES

This is an experimental personnel data collection form developed by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences pursuant to its research mission as prescribed in AR 70-1. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4. MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no effect on individuals for not providing all or any part of the information. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.

FORM   Privacy Act Statement - 26 Sep 75

DA Form 4368-R, 1 May 75

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - OESO QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This questionnaire should be completed by the OESO who
works most closely with the OENCO named below. The purpose of this
questionnaire is to provide the Army with accurate feedback information
about the OENCO Pilot Program. Your answers will be held in strict
confidence, and your anonymity will be maintained. Reports based on
this research will not identify individuals or units. Names are
requested only for follow-up purposes. (Completed questionnaires
should be mailed to the Army Research Institute, ATTN: PERI-IM-B,
Dr. Laurel Oliver, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333, in
the envelope provided for this purpose.)

The OENCO of concern for this questionnaire _____

1. Your name _____

2. Grade: ___(1) O-3   ___(4) O-6

          ___(2) O-4   ___(5) Other (please specify):   1:7

          ___(3) O-5   _____

3. MACOM: ___(1) FORSCOM   ___(6) USAREC

          ___(2) TRADOC   ___(7) MDW

          ___(3) USAREUR   ___(8) WESTCOM   1:8

          ___(4) INSCOM   ___(9) Other (please specify):

          ___(5) DARCOM   _____

4. Mailing Address: _____

                      _____

                      _____

5. AUTOVON: _____

6. Total number of OESOs in your OE office: (including yourself): _____   1:9,10

7. Total number of OENCOs in your OE office: _____   1:11,12

8. How many months has your OENCO worked in your OE office? _____ months   1:13,14

OESO-1

For items 9-12, please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

		Yes	No	Don't Know	
9.	Was your OE office consulted regarding the assignment of an OENCO before the assignment was made?	1	2	3	1:15
10.	Did your OE office request the assignment of an OENCO?	1	2	3	1:16
11.	Was the OENCO assigned to you in lieu of other personnel that you had requested?	1	2	3	1:17
12.	Before your OENCO arrived, did you have specific expectations about the role he/she would perform in your OE office and operations?	1	2	3	1:18

If you answered "No" to item 12, please skip to item 20. If you answered "Yes" to item 12, please rank the following titles according to how well they describe the role you expected your OENCO to play when he/she was assigned to your office. (Use "1" for that which best describes the expected OENCO role; "2" for that which next best describes it; "3" for next best; and so on.)

13. ___ OE Consultant   14. ___ Assistant OESO

15. ___ Administrator   16. ___ Survey Specialist

17. ___ Trainer   18. ___ Instructor

19. ___ Other (please specify): _____

Now rank the following titles according to how well they describe the role your OENCO is actually performing. (Use "1" for that which best describes his/her actual role; "2" for that which next best describes it; "3" for next best; and so on.)

20. ___ OE Consultant   21. ___ Assistant OESO

22. ___ Administrator   23. ___ Survey Specialist

24. ___ Trainer   25. ___ Instructor

26. ___ Other (please specify): _____

27. If there is a substantial difference between your rankings for the expected role and your rankings for the actual role, please explain.

During the past three months, please estimate the percent of on-duty time that your OENCO has spent on:

28. ___% OE mission-related activities

29. ___% Activities not related to OE mission

Check any of the following that were done to support the transition of your OENCO into his/her new position.

30. ___ Thinking about the role the OENCO should play in our OE office

31. ___ Notifying unit commanders of the addition of the OENCO to the OE staff

32. ___ Introducing OENCO to current clients

33. ___ Involving the OENCO in an operation for training purposes

34. ___ Conducting team building within the OE office with the OENCO

35. ___ Scheduling professional development activities for the OENCO

36. ___ Arranging clerical support for the OENCO

37. ___ Arranging for appropriate work space for the OENCO

38. ___ Providing necessary funding support

39. ___ Other (please specify):

1:37

1:38

1:39

1:40

1:41

1:42

1:43

1:44

1:45

1:46

_____

OESO-3

Indicate the relative frequency with which your OENCO performs the OE tasks listed below during normal on-duty time. Circle a "1" for the five tasks least frequently performed. Circle a "3" for the five tasks most frequently performed. Then circle a "2" for the remaining tasks.

		Least Frequent		Most Frequent	
40.	Marketing OE	1	2	3	1:47
41.	Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	1	2	3	1:48
42.	Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	1	2	3	1:49
43.	Interviewing individuals/groups	1	2	3	1:50
44.	Process observation	1	2	3	1:51
45.	Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	1	2	3	1:52
46.	Assessment analysis	1	2	3	1:53
47.	Giving organizational feedback	1	2	3	1:54
48.	Designing implementation (e.g., workshop, transition meeting)	1	2	3	1:55
49.	Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	1	2	3	1:56
50.	Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	1	2	3	1:57
51.	Documentation (time, costs, tracking your operations)	1	2	3	1:58
52.	Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	1	2	3	1:59
53.	Routine OE-related administration	1	2	3	1:60
54.	Reviewing literature for OE ideas	1	2	3	1:61
55.	Professional development activities	1	2	3	1:62
56.	Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	1	2	3	1:63
57.	Team building with OE personnel	1	2	3	1:64
58.	Other (please specify):				
	_____	1	2	3	1:65

OESO-4

62

Now indicate the relative frequency with which you perform the OE tasks listed below. Circle a "1" for the five tasks least frequently performed. Circle a "3" for the five tasks most frequently performed. Then circle a "2" for the remaining tasks.

		Least Frequent		Most Frequent	
59.	Marketing OE	1	2	3	1:66
60.	Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	1	2	3	1:67
61.	Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	1	2	3	1:68
62.	Interviewing individuals/groups	1	2	3	1:69
63.	Process observation	1	2	3	1:70
64.	Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	1	2	3	1:71
65.	Assessment analysis	1	2	3	1:72
66.	Giving organizational feedback	1	2	3	1:73
67.	Designing implementation (e.g., workshop, transition meeting)	1	2	3	1:74
68.	Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	1	2	3	1:75
69.	Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	1	2	3	1:76
70.	Documentation (time, costs, tracking your operations)	1	2	3	1:77
71.	Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	1	2	3	1:78
72.	Routine OE-related administration	1	2	3	1:79
73.	Reviewing literature for OE ideas	1	2	3	2:7
74.	Professional development activities	1	2	3	2:8
75.	Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	1	2	3	2:9
76.	Team building with OE personnel	1	2	3	2:10
77.	Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	2:11

OESO-5

C 3

For the tasks listed below, circle a "1" for the five tasks for which you have the lowest degree of confidence in your OENCO's skills and abilities; circle a "3" for the five tasks for which you have the highest degree of confidence. For the remaining tasks, circle a "2" to indicate an intermediate degree of confidence or a "4" to indicate you have no basis for making a judgment.

		Degree of Confidence				
		Lowest		Highest	No Basis	
78.	Marketing OE	1	2	3	4	2:12
79.	Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	1	2	3	4	2:13
80.	Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	1	2	3	4	2:14
81.	Interviewing individuals/groups	1	2	3	4	2:15
82.	Process observation	1	2	3	4	2:16
83.	Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	1	2	3	4	2:17
84.	Assessment analysis	1	2	3	4	2:18
85.	Giving organizational feedback	1	2	3	4	2:19
86.	Designing implementation (e.g., workshop, transition meeting)	1	2	3	4	2:20
87.	Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	1	2	3	4	2:21
88.	Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	1	2	3	4	2:22
89.	Documentation (time, costs; tracking your operations)	1	2	3	4	2:23
90.	Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	1	2	3	4	2:24
91.	Routine OE-related administration	1	2	3	4	2:25
92.	Reviewing literature for OE ideas	1	2	3	4	2:26
93.	Professional development activities	1	2	3	4	2:27
94.	Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	1	2	3	4	2:28
95.	Team building with OE personnel	1	2	3	4	2:29
96.	Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	4	2:30

64

In your OE office, how often does each of the following initiate the commitment of resources to OE work? (Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response. If category does not apply, leave item blank.)

		Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always	
97.	Key Manager	1	2	3	4	5	2:31
98.	Senior OESO	1	2	3	4	5	2:32
99.	Other OESOs	1	2	3	4	5	2:33
100.	OENCO	1	2	3	4	5	2:34

In your opinion, to what extent could your OENCO function effectively at the

		Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always	
101.	Company level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:35
102.	Battalion level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:36
103.	Brigade level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:37
104.	Installation/Division level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:38
105.	MACOM level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:39

How are decisions made concerning who does what in your OE shop? To what extent is each of the following considered in making assignments?

		Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always	
106.	Level of the client	1	2	3	4	5	2:40
107.	Client preference	1	2	3	4	5	2:41
108.	Preference of OESO/OENCO	1	2	3	4	5	2:42
109.	Skills of OESO/OENCO	1	2	3	4	5	2:43
110.	Whoever is available	1	2	3	4	5	2:44
111.	Whoever made initial contact	1	2	3	4	5	2:45
112.	Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	4	5	2:46

(65

How does your OENCO expand the capabilities of your OE office? Estimate the extent to which having an OENCO has affected the capabilities listed below. Please circle the number of your chosen response.

	Negligible Effect	Some Effect	Substantial Effect	
113. Provides "extra pair of hands" for the OESO(s).	1	2	3	2:47
114. Enables us to do more for each operation.	1	2	3	2:48
115. Enables us to serve more clients in given period of time.	1	2	3	2:49
116. Increases our ability to get good information from enlisted personnel.	1	2	3	2:50
117. Increases our credibility with commanders and NCOs.	1	2	3	2:51
118. Enables us to conduct different types of operations than we did before.	1	2	3	2:52
119. Provides access to different set of people than before.	1	2	3	2:53
120. Facilitates routine staff work.	1	2	3	2:54
121. Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	2:55

122. What should be the ratio of OENCOs to OESOs?

___(1) One OENCO for each OESO   ___(5) One OESO for 2 or 3 OENCOs

___(2) One OENCO for 2 or 3 OESOs   ___(6) One OESO for 4 or 5 OENCOs   2:56

___(3) One OENCO for 4 or 5 OESOs   ___(7) One OESO for 6 or more OENCOs

___(4) One OENCO for 6 or more OESOs

                                    ___(8) Other (please specify):

                                    _____

OESO-8

	Yes	No
123. Is this OENCO formally assigned to your OE office?	1	2
124. Do you have supervisory responsibility for this OENCO?	1	2

125. If you responded "No" to item 123 or item 124, please explain the nature of any supervisory and control difficulties that may have arisen.

126. How have the managerial/supervisory requirements associated with having an OENCO in your office affected your role as an OESO?

127. What has been your impression of this OENCO's overall competence?

Poor	Fair	Good	G. od	Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

128. To what extent has your OENCO lived up to the expectations *you* originally had for him/her?

___(1) Not quite lived up to those expectations.

___(2) Fully met those expectations.

___(3) Exceeded those expectations.

129. If you had your choice, which of the following would you prefer?

___(1) Another OENCO

___(2) Another OESO

___(3) Other (please specify): _____

130. Please state the reason for the choice you made in item 129.

OESO-9

67

Where possible, use records data
for items 131-136.

	For the three months <u>before</u> OENCO's arrival	For the past three months (with OENCO assigned)

131. How many separate OE operations did your OE office conduct?

_____ (2:62,63) _____

132. For how many different clients?

_____ (2:66,67) _____

133. On the average, how many weeks did a client wait from the time of request for OE services until action was initiated?

_____ (2:70,71) _____

134. On the average, how many calendar days did it take for your OE office to conduct the agreed-upon OE operation?

_____ (2:74,75) _____

135. What <u>percent</u> of their on-duty time did <u>OESOs</u> at your location spend on work "billable" to clients? (Work which is billable to a client involves all the preparation, direct contact, analysis, report writing, etc., such as a management consultant would charge for.)

_____% (3:7,8) _____%

136. What <u>percent</u> of their on-duty time did <u>OESOs</u> at your location spend on <u>OE</u> mission-related work not considered billable to clients? (Include professional development, research, etc.)

_____% (3:11,12) _____%

<u>Note:</u> The percentages for items 135 and 136 will not total 100%. It is expected that some proportion of time will be spent on normal administrative duties.

137. Please note below any factors that may have affected the numbers above (e.g., significant turnover, leave periods, reorganizations).

OESO-10

For the next three items, please circle the number
corresponding to your chosen response:

		Yes	No	
138.	Has a client ever requested that you not use this OENCO in an OE operation?	1	2	3:15
139.	Has this OENCO ever asked not to participate in an OE operation for a particular unit/organization?	1	2	3:16
140.	Has a client ever asked that this OENCO participate in an OE operation in his unit/organization?	1	2	3:17

141. What are those factors, personal and organizational, that are most
important to OENCO competency (e.g., formal education, verbal skills,
rank, previous Army experiences, local support)?

142. Please give us any additional information or comments that might
help us to understand better what having an OENCO has meant to
your OE office.

APPENDIX A-3

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - KEY MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE

AUGUST 1979

US ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE

BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PT 5303c

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974
(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM OENCO Pilot Program - Key Manager Questionnaire	PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE AR 70-1

1 AUTHORITY

10 USC Sec 4503

2 PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S)

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

3 ROUTINE USES

This is an experimental personnel data collection form developed by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences pursuant to its research mission as prescribed in AR 70-1. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4 MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no effect on individuals for not providing all or any part of the information. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.

FORM   Privacy Act Statement - 26 Sep 75

DA Form 4368-R, 1 May 75

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - KEY MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This questionnaire should be completed by Key Managers. Its purpose is to provide the Army with accurate feedback information about the OENCO Pilot Program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence, and your anonymity will be maintained. Reports based on this research will not identify individuals or units. Names are requested only for follow-up purposes. (Completed questionnaires should be mailed to the Army Research Institute, ATTN: PERI-IM-B, Dr. Laurel Oliver, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333, in the envelope provided for this purpose.)

The OENCO of concern for this questionnaire is _____

1. Your name: _____

2. Grade: ___ (1) 0-3   ___ (4) 0-6   1:7

          ___ (2) 0-4   ___ (5) Other (please specify):

          ___ (3) 0-5   _____

3. MACOM: ___ (1) FORSCOM   ___ (6) USAREC

        ___ (2) TRADOC   ___ (7) MDW   1:8

        ___ (3) USAREUR   ___ (8) WESTCOM

        ___ (4) INSCOM   ___ (9) Other (please specify):

        ___ (5) DARCOM   _____

4. Mailing Address: _____

                  _____

                  _____

5. AUTOVON: _____

6. Total number of OESOs in your OE office: _____   1:9,10

7. Total number of OENCOs in your OE office: _____   1:11,12

8. Are you a school-trained OESO (i.e., do you have an ASI 5Z)?

          ___(1) Yes

          ___(2) No

9. Have you attended the Key Manager's Course?

          ___(1) Yes

          ___(2) No

10. How many months has this OENCO been assigned to your office?

          _____ months

Check below the actions *you yourself* directed or performed to support the transition of this OENCO into his/her new position.

11. ___ Thinking about the role the OENCO should play in our OE office

12. ___ Notifying unit commanders of the addition of the OENCO to the OE staff

13. ___ Directing the OESOs to prepare for the reception of the OENCO into the OE office

14. ___ Arranging clerical support for the OENCO

15. ___ Arranging for appropriate work space for the OENCO

16. ___ Providing necessary funding support

17. ___ Other (please specify): _____

18. If you had your choice, which of the following would you prefer?

          ___(1) Another OESO

          ___(2) Another OENCO

          ___(3) Other (please specify): _____

19. Please state the reason for the choice you made in item 18.

Office Use Only column:
1:13
1:14
1:15,16
1:17
1:18
1:19
1:20
1:21
1:22
1:23
1:24

KM-2

74

How does your OENCO expand the capabilities of your OE office? Estimate the extent to which having an OENCO has affected the capabilities listed below. Please circle the number of your chosen response. If you cannot respond to the item, leave it blank.

		Has Had Negligible Effect	Has Had Some Effect	Has Had Substantial Effect	
20.	Enables us to do more for each operation.	1	2	3	1:25
21.	Enables the OE office to serve more clients in a given period of time.	1	2	3	1:26
22.	Increases ability to get good information from enlisted personnel.	1	2	3	1:27
23.	Enhances credibility of OE within the command.	1	2	3	1:28
24.	Enables the OE office to conduct different types of operations than we did before.	1	2	3	1:29
25.	Provides access to different set of people than before.	1	2	3	1:30
26.	Facilitates routine staff work.	1	2	3	1:31
27.	Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	1:32

28. Concerning this OENCO's strengths and weaknesses, what feedback have you received as a result of his/her participation in OE operations?

KM-3

29. What should be the relat⁔⁐ proportions of OENCOs and OESOs?

___(1) One OENCO for each OESO   ___(5) One OESO for 2 or 3 OENCOs

___(2) One OENCO for 2 or 3 OESOs   ___(6) One OESO for 4 or 5 OENCOs   1:33

___(3) One OENCO for 4 or 5 OESOs   ___(7) One OESO for 6 or more OENCOs

___(4) One OENCO for 6 or more OESOs   ___(8) Other (please specify):

_____

In your opinion, to what extent could this OENCO function effectively at the

	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always	
30. Company level?	1	2	3	4	5	1:34
31. Battalion level?	1	2	3	4	5	1:35
32. Brigade level?	1	2	3	4	5	1:36
33. Installation/Division level?	1	2	3	4	5	1:37
34. MACOM level?	1	2	3	4	5	1:38

35. What are those factors, personal and organizational, that are most important to OENCO competency (e.g., formal education, verbal skills, rank, previous Army experiences, local support).

36. Please give us any additional information or comments that might help us to understand better what having an OENCO has meant to your OE office.

76)